

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 and 12-21 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4-10 and 12-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gaquere (U.S. Pat. No. 5,581,867) in view of Aasgaard (U.S. Pat. No. 5,915,901). Claims 1-3 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gaquere in view of Siebol (U.S. Pat. No. 4,074,608). Claim 21 is further rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Gaquere in view of Siebol and further in view of Dolch (U.S. Pat. No. 4,236,429). In view of the arguments and amendments herein, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to independent Claims 1, 14 and 19. These claims have been amended to include the limitation that the flange portion is an integral portion of the cylindrical body, or that the body is a monolithic member. Claims 1, 14 and 19 have been further amended so as to contain the limitation that the sleeve of resilient material defines an inner bore bearing surface which is disposed about a portion of the cylindrical body. In this regard, each of the claims clarify in varying ways that the inner bore bearing surface is in uninterrupted contact or, in other words, is congruent with an outer surface which defines a portion of the rivet body adjacent to the head after the rivet has been set.

While Applicant submits that many of the references shown disclose rivets having elastic sealing members, none of these references alone or together teach the Applicant's invention. Specifically, Applicant notes that in each of the cited references, the elastic member is either deformed so as to not provide an uninterrupted contact surface with a portion of the rivet body or, the sleeve of resilient material is not exposed beyond the outer surface to provide a stop surface. As each of the independent claims contain this limitation in one form or another, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not anticipate or render obvious the independent claims or their associated dependents.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and

favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Nov 3-2006

By: 
Christopher A. Eusebi, Reg. No. 44,672

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

CAE/smb